

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Plaintiff(s),  
v.  
CHRISTOPHER TUCKER,  
Defendant(s).

Case No. 2:21-cv-02049-JCM-NJK

## Order

[Docket No. 30]

Pending before the Court is the Government's motion to compel discovery. Docket No. 31. Defendant filed a response. Docket No. 31. The Government filed a reply. Docket No. 32. Defendant's response includes no legal authority of any kind, *see* Docket No. 31, which constitutes consent to the granting of the motion, Local Rule 7-2(d) (failure to file "points and authorities" to support a motion constitutes consent to the granting of the motion). Accordingly, the motion to

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November 9, 2022

~~Nancy J. Koppe~~  
United States Magistrate Judge

<sup>1</sup> The Court declines to address the Government’s request for costs, which it raises in the motion in a single sentence. *See* Docket No. 30 at 10; *see also* *Kor Media Grp., LLC v. Green*, 294 F.R.D. 579, 582 n.3 (D. Nev. 2013) (courts only address arguments that are meaningfully developed). The Court declines to address Defendant’s request to add a witness, which he improperly includes within his responsive brief to the motion to compel. *See* Docket No. 31 at 4-5; *see also* Local Rule IC 2-2(b) (separate documents must be filed for different purposes); *Underwood v. O’Reilly Auto Enterps., LLC*, 2022 WL 1184883, at \*2 (D. Nev. Apr. 20, 2022) (discussing *Bank of N.Y. Mellon v. SFR Invs. Pool 1, LLC*, 2017 U.S. Dist. Lexis 132101, at \*2 (D. Nev. Aug. 18, 2018)).